*Howard Fast Tells Why He Broke Away, P. 2*

**At the Whittaker Hearing: Senator Hennings Defends Congressional Inquisition, Page 3**

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 12 MARCH 25, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

## A Double Game of Flim-Flam

The hectic comings and goings between Jerusalem and Washington become less bewildering if one realizes that what we are witnessing might be called a double flim-flam. The Israeli in finally withdrawing from Gaza and Sheikh el Sharm knew they were being gulled by Mr. Dulles but are trying to outmaneuver and embarrass him by taking at face value mealy-mouthed phrases never intended to be negotiable. Privately the Secretary of State has been explaining in vain that no real promises whatsoever were made to the Israeli. But as the Washington correspondent of the London *Sunday Times* reported March 17, "However cogently Mr. Dulles can prove that the President's assurances to Israel were mostly optical illusions, the impression created in Britain is that they must have had real substance" and if they are not fulfilled "the credit of the United States will have suffered another devaluation." Mr. Dulles blames the Israeli for creating this impression, and feels aggrieved by their tactics, like a confidence man who discovers to his consternation that he has not been dealing with honest people! They picked his wallet while he sold them the Brooklyn Bridge.

### An Easy Way to Seal Off Gaza

That decent respect for the good opinion of mankind on which Mr. Dulles harped in pressuring the Israeli to withdraw might now be brushed aside by him as nugatory if they did not still hold powerful military cards. Israel can hardly reinvade the Gaza strip at this time, risking a clash with United Nations forces. But the Jerusalem correspondent of the New York *Daily News* in an exclusive dispatch last Monday quoted an informed source as saying that Israel has a bold plan ready to seal off the Gaza strip against any mass reentry of Egyptian civil and military personnel by putting a cordon of troops across its southern border. The United Nations Emergency Force would thus be left in undisputed control of the Gaza Strip, a conflict with it would be avoided and Egypt would have to appeal again for aid to the UN.

How Washington would react to such a move is not at all clear. The joint communique extorted—that seems to be the right word for it—from Mr. Dulles by Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir is full of that baffling sleight-of-hand phrasing which years at Sullivan & Cromwell perfected; the Secretary of State is a master of the slippery codicil. A better guide to the Administration's real attitude may be found in the answers made by Mr. Eisenhower and by Mr. Dulles at press conferences before Mrs. Meir's whirlwind arrival when asked in substance how they felt about the quick Egyptian take-over in Gaza. Colonel Nasser can hardly be blamed if he concludes from their answers that the U.S. does not mind if Egypt resumes control of the Strip and limits the UN force to the border, where indeed he still needs it as a shield against Israel.

When the President was asked at his last press conference on March 13, "Would you like to see Egypt delay taking over the civil administration of the Gaza strip?", he had an opportunity for a word of warning to Egypt. Instead Mr. Eisenhower took a hands off attitude. He replied, "I would like to see the arrangements made that the United Nations and General (sic) Hammarskjold believes will be the most conducive to bringing on conditions in which real negotiations for the settlement of the problems can be achieved." When much the same question was put next day to Secretary Dulles at the press conference he held in Australia at the end of the SEATO meeting, he not only avoided any reproof to Nasser but succeeded in making it appear that Israel, not Egypt, was in the wrong.

### One of Those Non-Responsive Replies

Since this press conference in Canberra was scantily covered in the U.S. press, we give the crucial portion here from the official text at the State Department. Mr. Dulles was asked "Was it the hope of your government when the United Nations first moved into the Gaza strip that they would remain for some considerable time?" Rather than admit this, Mr. Dulles evaded the question. "We believe" was his reply," that it would be desirable to have the United Nations Emergency Force function as a barrier between Israel and the neighboring Arab countries. That has been difficult to work out, partly because Israel has not wanted to have any elements of the United Nations Force on the Israeli side of the boundary and Egypt has not wanted to have them exclusively on the Egyptian or Gaza strip of the boundary."

This was hardly, as Mr. Dulles likes to say, a responsive reply. Israel did not withdraw on the assumption that both sides of all its borders would be patrolled but on the assumption that the United Nations would take over the Gaza strip. Some reporter in Australia saw this at once and asked as the next question, "Did the Israeli Government agree to withdraw its forces on the assumption of the United Nations barrier?" Again Mr. Dulles managed to give an anti-Israeli twist to the answer, "No," he replied, "I would hardly say that, because Israel itself has been the principal obstacle to creating that barrier."

### The Doctrine's Hidden Corollary

The State Department is maneuvering to give Nasser an out and put Israel in the wrong by pressuring Ben Gurion to admit UNEF to Israeli territory; this was the purpose of the five power meeting held at the Department the day before Mrs. Meir's arrival. The only way to sell the Eisenhower Doctrine to the Arab States is at Israel's expense. This is the unspoken premise of Administration policy, the key to Middle Eastern events.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Howard Fast: "I Felt . . . A Victim of The Most Incredible Swindle Of Modern Times"**

# What America's Foremost Communist Writer Said in His Farewell

*On this page we present the heart of Howard Fast's article, "My Decision", from the March, 1957, issue of Mainstream, successor to the New Masses, telling why he was breaking with the Communists, and a sample of the curiously defensive reply by the editors of that publication. Instead of denouncing Fast, they plead that it is guilt by association to link them with Krushchev and Stalin! That a Communist publication should have published his article and such a reply is itself a political portent. Not so hopeful, however, is the fact that the Soviet press so far has not published a single line of the sensational news that America's foremost Communist novelist whose works were translated and treasured in the Soviet Union had broken with the movement. For our part we take our hat off to Howard Fast for courage and integrity.—IFS*

By Howard Fast

I joined the communist movement for two reasons. I believed that in the Communist party was the beginning of a true brotherhood of man, working with devotion for socialism, peace and democracy. Secondly, I believed that the Communist Party offered the most effective resistance to Fascism. As a part of this, I believed, as did millions of men of good will, that the only truth about the Soviet Union was the picture presented by friends of the Soviet Union. . . .

Nevertheless, I and others within the Communist Party realized that something was tragically wrong in the world communist movement long before the Krushchev "secret speech" appeared. We were asked to swallow such absurdities as the Soviet theory of "cosmopolitanism". We saw Jewish culture disappear in Russia, and all our pleas for explanation brought only silence. . . .

We also witnessed many disturbing internal factors in the Communist Party of the U.S., a destroying rigidity and unbendingness, a narrowing of approach and purpose that made it impossible for many good people to remain within it. These things marked a process of development, both in myself and in many others. Yet it did not prepare us for the explosive and hellish revelations of the Krushchev "secret report." . . . I felt, as so many did then, a sense of being a victim of the most incredible swindle in modern times. . . .

## The Hope Was Disappointed

I waited nine months before I took the step I am explaining here. I waited because it was my whole life as well as the lives and hopes of so many dear friends that was involved; I also waited because friends whom I respected argued thus: ". . . Now things will change. Stalin is dead. New leaders are in power now. They must change." It was at least a hope. . . .

What was the result of that nine months? . . . From the Soviet Union itself we learned of two more executions, and the blood hardly dry on the Krushchev report! From Krushchev himself we were treated to a new mode of diplomacy—diplomacy by insult and vulgarity. From the crisis in Egypt we learned of the new brink of-war tactics of Soviet foreign affairs. For the first time, in relation to Israel, we witnessed the elevation of anti-Semitism to foreign policy.

In November, 1956, Premier Bulganin sent notes to Great Britain, France and Israel. The notes to Britain and France were both reasonable and conciliatory in tone; the note to Israel was couched as an ultimatum in a tone both shrill and insulting. Since Israel was the least culpable of the three, and the only one of the three acting in terms of direct national security, the uncontrolled prejudice was both apparent and significant.

## Socialism Without Democracy

In Russia we have socialism without democracy. We have socialism without trial by jury, *habeas corpus*, or the right against self-incrimination, which is no more or less than protection against the abuse of confession by torture. We have socialism without civil liberty. We have socialism without the power of recall of government. We have socialism without public avenues of protest. We have socialism without equality for minorities. We have socialism without any right of free artistic creation. In so many words, we have socialism without morality. . . .

I have come to believe that within the very structure and historical development of the Communist Parties, as we know them in recent years, there is an almost incurable antithesis to the socialist democracy which they name as their ultimate goal. In a struggle against fascism and colonial oppression, history has shown these parties to be magnificently disciplined and courageous, but in other circumstances they fall prey to a tragic contradiction. Programatically for freedom, their very structure denies freedom within itself; against oppression, their very structure oppresses within itself; and conceived as a liberating force, the monolithic power structure chokes both the democratic process and the liberating thought. Their historical development has been toward an ever more rigid bureaucracy—and this very process nurtures an egotistic and dehumanized stratum of leadership. . . .

It is this development which is being fought by a great many American Communists who remain within the organization of the Communist Party, and I acknowledge their integrity and purpose. But can one for a moment believe that a similar struggle is possible in the Soviet Union? . . .

## Appeals from Eastern Europe

Since the appearance of the Krushchev "secret report" nine months ago and since my initial written response to it, a number of things have happened to me personally. A flow of letters from the countries of Eastern Europe have pleaded heart-breakingly for succor—as if I had some power to intervene against the terrors and sufferings that beset them or some special persuasiveness to direct toward their leaders. I am afraid, however, that criticism of any validity is as abhorrent to the Kremlin leadership as social justice. . . .

As a postscript to the above, since it was written I received the inevitable summons from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to appear before them as a friendly witness. I made no bones about showing them, not only that I was an unfriendly witness but that I utterly despised all that they represented. Nothing I have said about injustice and petty tyranny here at home, or about the assorted madness of our foreign policy has been withdrawn in my mind. . . . I intend to continue my solidarity with all people of good-will in America, communist and non-communist, who fight injustice. . . .

### Just A Bad Check That Bounced!

**"Consider the manner of his [Fast's] reasoning. He says that he is protesting the course of happenings in the Communist world, and that the Communist Party of the U. S. is compromised by events which are mostly beyond its control. How compromised? By matters of which its members could not know, by acts which they do not condone and in fact condemn? If a friend passes a bad check one may be 'compromised', but only through guilt by association, to which Howard Fast does not subscribe. Yet so much of the article is devoted to Stalin and Krushchev that one might think he was resigning from a party to which he never belonged: the Soviet Communist Party."**

*—Editors of Mainstream, Reply to Howard Fast.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**The Whittaker Hearing: New Supreme Court Justice No Friend of Academic Freedom**

# How Senator Hennings Defended Inquisition-by-Congress

The confused view even among liberals as to the proper limits of the Congressional power of investigation was vividly disclosed by Senator Hennings of Missouri last week. This was during the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on the nomination of Judge Charles Evans Whittaker to the U.S. Supreme Court. Fyke Farmer, the Nashville, Tenn., lawyer who won that sensational last minute stay from Mr. Justice Douglas in the Rosenberg case, testified against the appointment. Farmer was counsel for Prof. Horace B. Davis, dismissed despite his tenure rights from the University of Kansas City in 1953 after he pleaded the Fifth amendment before the Senate Internal Security Committee. When Dr. Davis went to court, Judge Whittaker dismissed his suit without trial and declared that the public "ought not to stand for such reticence or refusals to answer by the teachers in their schools."

The Whittaker hearing was thus the obverse of the recent hearing by the same committee on the Brennan appointment. Judge Brennan was attacked by McCarthy for criticizing the abuses of Congressional inquiry; Judge Whittaker was attacked for upholding these abuses by ruling that a teacher could be discharged after invoking his constitutional rights. To the delight of Chairman Eastland, Senator Hennings soon emerged as the champion of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

"Is it your view, sir," Senator Hennings asked Mr. Farmer, "that a university has no right to dismiss a professor unwilling to give a Senate committee any information about his teaching and writing, irrespective of the Communist question?"

Mr. Farmer said that such interrogation was outside the lawful powers of a Senate committee. This seemed to startle Senator Hennings. His question revealed a twofold confusion. By saying "irrespective of the Communist question", the Senator may have thought he was demonstrating liberalism. But even the reactionaries have never dared affirm a general Congressional right to investigate ideas. Their excuse has always been (a la the insidious sophism of Sidney Hook) that Communist ideas and associations were in a special category as conspiratorial rather than heretical. Hennings implied that Congress could investigate the dissemination of ideas of any kind.

**The Wm. A. Price Trial: A First Amendment Issue That Cannot Easily Be Evaded**

# Hennings Took The Same Naive Attitude in the Press Investigation

A similar attitude by Senator Hennings will figure in the appeals of the newspapermen now being convicted for contempt of the Senate Internal Security Committee in its "infiltration of the press" hearings in January of 1956. In the summation at the trial here of William A. Price, found guilty of contempt after invoking the First Amendment, attention was called by defense counsel Leonard Boudin to the colloquoy between Senators Hennings and Eastland with which those hearings opened. There again, in an effort presumably to make his position as a liberal clear, the Senator from Missouri said the hearings were not an attack upon the New York Times or "upon the free press" but merely an effort to uncover possible attempts by the Communist party "to influence or subvert the American press."

But in practice, as his other remarks showed, again with Senator Eastland's approval, this entailed subjecting the editorial content and the executives of the American press to scrutiny by a Congressional committee. For Senator Henning said, "the best evidence of any subversion or infiltration . . . is certainly the product itself," and added "I do think that at some later time, perhaps, it might be appropriate for executives of some of the newspapers under inquiry . . . to be called and to testify and for them to show, if they can show, that the end product, the newspaper itself has not been influenced by these efforts." This naively assumes that despite the First Amendment, giving Congress no right to abridge freedom of the press, a Congressional committee may examine editorials and editors to see whether they have been spreading ideas some members of Congress may consider subversive.

Let us take a concrete example of what such an attitude involves. In the Whittaker hearing, Fyke Farmer quoted from an editorial in the *New York Times*, endorsing certain apprehensions expressed on February 19, 1955, by Chief Justice Warren in a speech in St. Louis. "Where," the *New York Times* said of attacks on persons taking the Fifth amendment, "shall the line of condemnation be drawn? If it is wrong to refuse to testify against one's self is it also wrong to object to unlawful search and seizure, to the taking of property without due process of law, to the deprival of trial by jury, to the infliction of cruel and inhuman punishments, to the abridgment of the freedom of the press. . . ."

What if the writer of that editorial, the editor in charge of the editorial page and the publisher were to be subpoenaed —in accordance with the Hennings suggestion—and questioned about that editorial? What if they were questioned to determine whether it was an "honest" expression of opinion or (in J. Edgar Hoover's phrase) a "pseudo-liberal" effort to shield Communists? What if, in order to determine this, they were questioned about their schooling, their past, their relatives, and their associations? If a Congressional committee can put editors in the pillory and smear them with all kinds of invidious questions to determine whether their writing was proper or improper, the First Amendment would be shattered. The fear of such inquiry would go far to inhibit non-conformity.

**Those New York and Chicago Hearings for Foreign Language and Radical Papers**

# The House Un-American Committee Already Putting Editors in the Pillory

This is no longer a hypothetical situation. The hearings of January, 1955, by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee were cut short by protest and never dared investigate the content of newspapers. But the recent hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in New York and now being held in Chicago did just that. Editors of obscure foreign language publications, with circulations so tiny as to make the attack upon them ludicrous, were asked all kinds of questions about their attitude on the Korean war and other questions. Little attention has been paid to these hearings because they involved minuscule and little known papers, or men who work or have worked on the *Daily Worker* and other Communist papers. But these hearings establish precedents and begin the task of winning public acquiescence in the Un-American notion that Congress has a right to police the press against dangerous ideas.

When a Senator as liberal as Hennings, the chairman of the Senate subcommittee on constitutional rights, shows as much confusion and lack of understanding as he does on the fundamental issue, public education is badly needed.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Law Needed to Guarantee Free Union Elections; Plot Thickens in That Spy Case**

# Britain at Bermuda: Sick of Arms Race and Cold War

*The Bermuda Conference:* Even America's oldest and strongest ally can no longer bear the burdens of the arms race and the cold war: military retrenchment, withdrawal of troops from Europe, resumption of trade with China are necessary if Britain's economic back is not to be broken. . . . If this point is grasped, much about the whole world situation becomes clearer. . . . Everywhere there is creeping inflation due largely to the abnormal demands made on materials and manpower by the continued Russo-American quarrel, its divison of the world, its derangement of normal trade channels, its diversion of human energy and wealth to the most expensive and murderous military toys the world has ever seen. . . . In this context, at home, the most hopeful development is the growing revolt in Congress against the notion that the military budget is sacrosanct. . . . It will spread as even our own rich country cuts necessary expenditures on schools and health and roads and basic necessities in a desperate effort to cut the budget without touching that major share of it which goes to war preparations. . . .

*Guarantee Free Union Elections:* The McClellan investigation is doing for the labor movement what it demonstrably could not do for itself—expose the finest collection of phonies who ever fattened on a working class payroll. The harm the NAM and similar groups can do with these revelations is less than the danger in letting the cancer of racketeering grow. One way to block bad labor legislation is for the labor movement to propose its own program. One kind of reform badly needed is a guarantee of democracy within unions. A law providing for annual elections, a secret ballot and an honest count under public auspices would help. Dissenting union members should also have the right of access to membership lists so they can reach them for campaign purposes.

*In the Game of Bluff:* The U.S. did call a Soviet bluff when the Aswan dam offer was withdrawn; Nasser was turned down by Moscow. What happens now if the Polish loan delegation goes home empty handed, or with little more than some agricultural surpluses? Fantastically high hopes have been built up in Poland, and the other satellites are watching. If Poland fails, Moscow will say it called the U.S. bluff and the Stalinists in the satellites will argue that the only hope of aid lies in full submission to Moscow.

*Too Late Again?:* It is almost the end of March. In the House the civil rights bill still has to get out of Rules and in the Senate it must get past Eastland. The Southerners may succeed again this year in blocking legislation.

*Two and Two:* With the confirmation of Brennan and Whittaker, Eisenhower has now put two liberals (Warren and Brennan) and two conservatives (Harlan and Whittaker) on the Court. . . . *Plot Thickens:* Borros Morros, the mystery man in the forthcoming trial of the Sobles and Albam for conspiracy to deliver secrets to the U.S.S.R., was described on September 15, 1949, before the Senate Judiciary Committee ("Communist Activity Among Aliens in National Groups", Vol. 2, page 813) as the Hollywood contact of Vassili M. Zubelin, "head of the NKVD foreign information service" until he left this country in 1944. Now Morros crops up as government witness and is described by the U.S. Attorney as "a loyal and respected citizen."

## Where "Foreign Aid" Is Going

The latest report of the International Cooperation Administration made available last week and covering the quarter ended last September 30 shows total foreign aid fund allocations in that quarter of $209,148,000. Of this amount, $162,202,000 or almost 80 percent went to "defense support," i.e. maintenance of armies beyond the economic capacity of certain allied countries.

These were mainly South Korea, South Indo-China and Formosa. Of the $209,148,000 total aid for the quarter, $141,200,000, i.e. better than two thirds, actually almost 68 percent, went to Korea, Indo-China and Formosa. And of $141,200,000 allocated to these three places, $138,600,000, or more than 98 percent was for "defense support."

In other words the bulk of "foreign aid" today is part of our cold war with Communist China, the maintenance of huge armies in the countries we have split with Peking. These aid figures do not include the amount spent directly for military equipment. This is "classified" but is far greater than the "defense support" figure.

The Hannah report made public last week by the Senate Committee on the Foreign Aid program discloses that tiny Korea "now has the second largest army in the free world, numbering over 700,000 men," and spends more than half its budget for military purposes but adds comfortingly that to maintain an American army in Korea "would cost between 6 and 10 times as much." Thus "foreign aid" goes chiefly to maintain cheap auxiliary "coolie" armies in our unresolved quarrel with Peking.

***Why Not Write Us For Some Free Sample Copies for That Next Meeting of Your Union or Club?***

**I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.**
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....
3/25/57

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

*I. F. Stone's Weekly*
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 301 E. Capitol St., Washington 3, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED